



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/705,199 | 11/12/2003 | David J.P. Baar | 198821-388249 | 2923 |
| 27155 | 7590 | 02/06/2008 | EXAMINER | |
| McCarthy Tetrault LLP Box 48 Suite #4700 Toronto Dominion Bank Tower TORONTO, ON M5K 1E6 CANADA | | | DEBNATH, SUMAN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2135 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 02/06/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/705,199 | BAAR, DAVID J.P. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Suman Debnath | 2135 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-2, 10, 12-14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cromer et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0093567 A1) (hereinafter “Cromer”).

4. As to claim 1, Cromer discloses a method for controlling access to secured information for a predetermined region of a computer generated original image presented on a display (abstract), comprising:

determining whether a user is authorized to access said secured information ([0034]); and, in response to said determining, distorting said original image to produce a distorted region for said predetermined region to provide said user with said secured information on said display ([0032], [0034], see also [0011], [0031], lines 14-19).

5. As to claim 2, Cromer discloses further comprising, in response to said determining, uncovering said distorted region ([0032], [0034], see also [0011], [0031], lines 14-19).

6. As to claim 10, Cromer discloses wherein said secured information is detailed information ([0032], [0034]).

7. As to claim 12, Cromer discloses wherein said secured information is encrypted information ([0022] – [0023]).

8. As to claim 13, Cromer discloses wherein said distorting further comprises decrypting said encrypted information ([0022] – [0023]).

9. As to claim 14, Cromer discloses wherein said original image includes at least one of a graphic image, a photographic image, and a text image (abstract, [0031]).

10. As to claim 20, Cromer discloses a method for accessing detailed information for a predetermined region of a computer generated original image presented on a display (abstract), comprising:

determining whether a user is authorized to access said detailed information ([0034]); and, in response to said determining, distorting said original image to produce

a distorted region for said predetermined region to provide said user with said detailed information on said display ([0032], [0034], see also [0011], [0031], lines 14-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer and further in view of Brew et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196114 A1) (hereinafter "Brew").

13. As to claim 3, Cromer doesn't' explicitly disclose wherein said determining further comprises receiving authentication information from said user and comparing said authentication information to stored authentication information for said user. However, Brew discloses wherein said determining further comprises receiving authentication information from said user and comparing said authentication information to stored authentication information for said user (FIG. 10, [0085], lines 5-7 and lines 11-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Brew in order to "control access to protected content (Brew, [0009])."

14. As to claim 4, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information includes at least one of a user identification number and a password. However, Brew discloses wherein said authentication information includes at least one of a user identification number and a password ([0085], lines 11-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Brew in order to "control access to protected content (Brew, [0009])."

15. Claims 7-9, 11 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer and further in view of Robertson et al. (Patent No.: US 5,670,984) (hereinafter "Robertson").

16. As to claim 7, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose further comprising receiving a signal from said user to select said predetermined region. However, Robertson discloses comprising receiving a signal from said user to select a predetermined region (col. 4, lines 29-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

17. As to claim 8, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said signal is generated by moving a cursor on said display with a pointing device. However, Robertson discloses wherein said signal is generated by moving a cursor on said display with a pointing device (col. 4, lines 29-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

18. As to claim 9, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said pointing device is a mouse. However, Robertson discloses wherein said pointing device is a mouse (col. 4, lines 29-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

19. As to claim 11, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said detailed information is a magnified image. However, Robertson discloses wherein said detailed information is a magnified image (col. 1, lines 25-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made

quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

20. As to claim 15, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said distorting further includes by applying a distortion function defining to said original image to produce said distorted region by displacing said original image onto said distortion function and projecting said displaced original image onto a plane. However, Robertson discloses wherein said distorting further includes by applying a distortion function defining to said original image to produce said distorted region by displacing said original image onto said distortion function and projecting said displaced original image onto a plane (col. 4, lines 29-37, col. 6, lines 34-50, col. 7, lines 30-41, col. 8, lines 14-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

21. As to claim 16, Cromer doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said applying further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over said distorted region for receiving one or more signals for adjusting said distortion function. However, Robertson discloses wherein said applying further includes displaying a graphical user interface

("GUI") over said distorted region for receiving one or more signals for adjusting said distortion function (col. 4, lines 29-37, col. 6, lines 34-50, col. 7, lines 30-41, col. 8, lines 14-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

22. As to claim 17, doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said distortion function includes a focal region having a magnification for said predetermined region at least partially surrounded by a shoulder region where said magnification decreases to that of said original image to provide context for said predetermined region with respect to said original image, and said GUI is for adjusting at least one of:

said magnification; a concavity of said shoulder region; an extent for said focal region; an extent for said shoulder region; a location for said distortion function within said original image; a location for an outline of said shoulder region within said original image; and a location for said focal region relative to said shoulder region to define a degree and a direction of a folding of said distortion function.

However, Robertson discloses wherein said distortion function includes a focal region having a magnification for said predetermined region at least partially surrounded by a shoulder region where said magnification decreases to that of said original image

to provide context for said predetermined region with respect to said original image, and said GUI is for adjusting at least one of (abstract):

said magnification; a concavity of said shoulder region; an extent for said focal region; an extent for said shoulder region; a location for said distortion function within said original image; a location for an outline of said shoulder region within said original image; and a location for said focal region relative to said shoulder region to define a degree and a direction of a folding of said distortion function (col. 4, lines 29-37, col. 6, lines 34-50, col. 7, lines 30-41, col. 8, lines 14-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer as taught by Robertson in order to provide “a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46).”

23. Claims 5-6 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cromer and further in view of Brew and Foley et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0087894 A1) (hereinafter “Foley”).

24. As to claim 5, neither Cromer nor Brew explicitly discloses wherein said authentication information is received through a dialog box. However, Foley discloses a method of receiving authentication information through a dialog box ([0026], lines 5-7).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

25. As to claim 6, neither Cromer nor Brew explicitly discloses wherein said dialog box is presented adjacent to said predetermined region. However, Foley discloses a method of receiving authentication information through a dialog box ([0026], lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

26. As to claim 18, neither Cromer nor Brew explicitly discloses wherein said authentication information is biometric information. However, Foley discloses the authentication information is biometric information ([0026], lines 21-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

27. As to claim 19, neither Cromer nor Brew explicitly discloses wherein said biometric information includes fingerprint, iris pattern, voice pattern, and DNA pattern information. However, Foley discloses the method wherein said biometric information includes fingerprint, iris pattern, voice pattern, and DNA pattern information ([0026], lines 21-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Cromer and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

28. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground (s) of rejection is made. See rejection above.

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suman Debnath whose telephone number is 571 270 1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD



KIM VU
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2135
COMBINED PATENT EXAMINING CENTER 2100